

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 6, 59 and 60 were amended. The amendments are supported by the specification as filed, for example at: Abstract, ¶ 0008, 0024, 0031, 0033, and Figures 1A, 2A. No new matter was added.

A. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 and 9 are patentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism and in further view of Lewis because neither of these references teaches or suggests acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms on the network using the capture templates wherein the capture templates control the acquisition and extraction process, as claimed.

Whitledge neither teaches nor suggests acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network using capture templates, wherein the capture templates control the acquisition and extraction process, as presently recited in claims 1 and 6. The Office Action does not contradict this assertion: "Whitledge also does not teach expressly acquiring the data from disparate source." (Office Action page 3).

Adding the teachings of "Spyglass Prism: Concepts and Applications", fails to cure Whitledge's deficiencies. The Spyglass Prism reference describes translation of richly formatted web content, like tables, JPEG's, etc., into formats that match the relatively limited display capabilities on many mobile devices. (Spyglass Prism, Page 1-2). This reference does not, however, teach or suggest acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network using capture templates that control the acquisition and extraction process. Hence, claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over the combination of Whitledge and Spyglass Prism.

Adding the teachings of Lewis (U.S. Patent 6,513,019) does not overcome the deficiencies of Whitledge and Spyglass Prism. Lewis describes an integrated data reporting system for real time data entry, assessment, and report generation. (Lewis Abstract). This reference describes a system where business rules are used from a database to extract information from incoming transaction which come in as messages. (Lewis col. 6 ll. 7-14, col. 16 ll. 38-63). This extraction and recordation of data from

incoming messages should not be confused with acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network using capture templates that control the acquisition and extraction process, as recited in claims 1 and 6. Instead, in the Lewis system, data is received by means of incoming messages; rather than being acquired from disparate content sources in a network, as controlled by capture templates. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over the combination of Whitledge, Spyglass Prism and Lewis.

B. The remaining dependent claims are patentable over Whitledge, Spyglass Prism and Lewis, even when considered in combination with Lonnroth and Arens.

Claims 3 and 8

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected as being unpatentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism and Lewis and further in view of Lonnroth, U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597.

Lonnroth discusses a system and method for providing clients with services to retrieve data from data sources that do not necessarily support the protocol and format required by the clients. (Lonnroth Abstract). This scheme does not involve acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network using capture templates that control the acquisition and extraction process, as recited in claims 1 and 6. Instead, intermediate response XML documents are created from received HTML content, those documents are filtered by selectively removing content according to filtering rules, and an XSL styling sheet is applied to format the response document according to another set of rules associated with the style sheet. (Lonnroth Abstract). Neither the response XML document nor the XSL styling sheet described by Lonnroth can be considered a capture template created to acquire content as recited in the present claims.

Thus, adding the teachings of Lonnroth to those of Whitledge, Spyglass Prism and Lewis would not alter the conclusions of patentability with respect to claims 1 and 6 set forth above. Because these independent claims would remain patentable over the combination of references it follows that dependent claims 3 and 8 would likewise be patentable over these references.

Claims 5 and 10

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected as being unpatentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism and Lewis and further in view of Arens, "Intelligent Caching: Selecting, Representing, and Reusing Data in an Information Server", which discusses caching results of queries and how to use such cached results for future queries. Arens, however, does not describe acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network using capture templates that control the acquisition and extraction process, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6 and the Office Action does not contend otherwise. Hence, the patentability of independent claims 1 and 6, and by implication their respective dependent claims 5 and 10, is not affected by adding the teachings of Arens. Stated differently, these claims remain patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

C. Contrary to the conclusions set forth in the Office Action, claims 59 and 60 are patentable over Whitledge in view of Lewis.

Claim 59 includes the feature of harvesting content from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network by accessing content and media assets based on acquisition rules stored in a repository. Whitledge does not have any provision to harvest content and media assets from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network based on acquisition rules stored in a repository. See, Office Action at pages 3 and 8.

Adding the teachings of Lewis fails to cure Whitledge's deficiencies. Lewis describes business rules stored in database that are used to extract desired information from incoming messages. (Lewis col. 6 ll. 7-14). However, Lewis neither teaches nor suggests harvesting content from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network by accessing content and media assets based on acquisition rules stored in a repository, as recited in independent claim 59. The system described in Lewis is based on extracting information from incoming messages, rather than harvesting data from disparate content sources in a network.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 59 and its respective dependent claims, are patentable over the combination of Whitledge and Lewis.

For all of the foregoing reasons, all the present claims are patentable over the references cited in the Office Action. If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge our deposit account no. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: August 1, 2008

/Tarek N. Fahmi/

Tarek N. Fahmi

Reg. No. 41,402

P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
650-798-0320